



401 B Street, Suite 800
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231
 (619) 699-1900
 Fax (619) 699-1905
 www.sandag.org

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MEMBER AGENCIES

Cities of
 Carlsbad
 Chula Vista
 Coronado
 Del Mar
 El Cajon
 Encinitas
 Escondido
 Imperial Beach
 La Mesa
 Lemon Grove
 National City
 Oceanside
 Poway
 San Diego
 San Marcos
 Santee
 Solana Beach
 Vista
 and
 County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Imperial County
 California Department
 of Transportation
 Metropolitan
 Transit System
 North County
 Transit District
 United States
 Department of Defense
 San Diego
 Unified Port District
 San Diego County
 Water Authority
 Southern California
 Tribal Chairmen's Association
 Mexico

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

The Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Tuesday, November 8, 2011

1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
 401 B Street
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Keith Greer
 (619) 699-7390
 kgr@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- **CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE NEXT STEPS**
- **AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012 GRANTS**
- **MITIGATION ENDOWMENTS AT SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION**
- **MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN STATUS**

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
 Phone 511 or see www.511sd.com for route information.
 Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, November 8, 2011

ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Chair, SANDAG Board Member, Carrie Downey, City of Coronado Council Member)	
+2. SUMMARY OF THE JULY 12, 2011, MEETING Review and approve the meeting summary of the July 12, 2011, meeting.	APPROVE Estimated Start Time: 1:00 – 1:05
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the EMPWG coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the EMPWG coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to EMPWG members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. EMPWG members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.	COMMENT Estimated Start Time: 1:05 – 1:10
4. CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE NEXT STEPS (Grace Chung, SANDAG; and Yvonne Moore, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program) Staff from SANDAG and the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program will provide a status update of the Conserved Lands Database and the proposed next steps to work with land owners and managers to fill in missing attributes.	INFORMATION Estimated Start Time: 1:10 – 1:30
+5. AD HOC COMMITTEE’S REVIEW OF PAST GRANT CYCLES AND RECOMMENDATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2012 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS (Vice Chair Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad; and Yvonne Moore, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program) As part of the EMPWG’s desire to continually improve the land management grant process, Ms. Yvonne Moore of the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program has interviewed past applicants, reviewers, and stakeholders and will provide a summary of her findings. In addition, an ad hoc committee of the EMP was formed to review Ms. Moore’s findings and make recommendations for Fiscal Year 2012 land management grants. Vice-chair, Mike Grim chaired the ad hoc meeting and will present their recommendations.	DISCUSSION/ RECOMMENDATION Estimated Start Time: 1:30 – 2:00

ITEM #**RECOMMENDATION****6. MITIGATION ENDOWMENTS AT SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION
(Karen Begin and Simona Valanciute, The San Diego Foundation)**

INFORMATION

The San Diego Foundation (TSDF) is a community foundation which manages charitable funds and supports nonprofit and public organizations in the San Diego region. Besides managing endowments set up by families, individuals and corporations, the Foundation also manages conservation and mitigation endowments. TSDF staff will provide information on investment strategies, financial performance, fees, and process for establishing funds that could be used for activities such as habitat management and mitigation.

Estimated Start Time:
2:00 – 2:45**7. MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATED
(Ron Remple, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program)**

INFORMATION

Mr. Remple will provide a brief status report on the progress made on the management strategic plan including a schedule of upcoming events.

Estimated Start Time:
2:45 – 2:55**8. NEXT MEETING**

Next meeting of the EMPWG is scheduled for January 10, 2011.

Estimated Start Time:
2:55 – 3:00

Tentative topics: Regional Needs Assessment Update, Final Dahlem Report Presentation, and Management Strategic Plan.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

San Diego Association of Governments
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
WORKING GROUP

November 8, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF THE JULY 12, 2011, MEETING

Members in Attendance:

Carrie Downey (Chair), Councilmember City of Coronado
Mike Grim (Vice Chair), City of Carlsbad, North County Coastal
Bruce April, Caltrans
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League
Leann Carmichael, County of San Diego
Anne Harvey, San Diego Conservation Network
Jeanne Krosch, City of San Diego
Maria Lundstedt, Chula Vista, South County
Jim Lyon, City of Poway
Kevin Mallory, City of Santee, East Suburban Communities
David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Game
Carlton Rochester, U.S. Geological Survey
Bill Tippets, The Nature Conservancy
Jim Whalen, Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others in Attendance:

Cathy Chadwick, EDI
Megan Hamilton, County of San Diego
David Hogan, Chaparral Lands Conservancy
Barbara Kus, U.S. Geological Survey
Yvonne Moore, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program
Kailash Mozumder, ICF
Tom Oberbauer, AECOM
Ron Rempel, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program
Christina Schaefer, TAIC
Marcus Spiegelberg, CNLM

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:

Keith Greer
Rob Rundle
Katie Levy

ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Vice Chair Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad, called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m.

ITEM #2: MAY 17, 2011, MEETING SUMMARY

Carlton Rochester, U.S. Geological Survey, made a correction that his talk in Israel was regarding vertebrates, not invertebrates. He also stated that the date listed in Agenda Item 6, page 28 of the Agenda Packet should be 2010, not 2011. Bill Tippetts, The Nature Conservancy, motioned to approve the meeting summary from May 17, 2011, and Jim Whalen, Alliance for Habitat Conservation, seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public comments. Keith Greer, SANDAG, noted that copies of the Final Report from the Land Management Proctor Valley Off-Road Vehicle Barrier grant project by the City of San Diego Department of Water were available for the EMPWG to review. Additionally, this has been an effective project and the California Department of Fish and Game is currently working on extending the same barriers on their lands on Proctor Valley Road. Mr. Whalen asked what kind of steel barriers were used. Mr. Greer responded the material is brown steel, which was chosen for its known effectiveness in state parks and forests.

ITEM #4: UPDATE ON QUALITY OF LIFE FUNDING STRATEGY

Rob Rundle, SANDAG, provided a status report on the Quality of Life Funding Strategy. In April 2011, a draft questionnaire was presented to the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) and the Ad Hoc Steering Committee (AHSC). Both groups provided several comments and a revised questionnaire was presented in May 2011. The SWG and AHSC concurred with the revised May 2011 questionnaire, and a survey was conducted after the Memorial Day weekend. The results from the survey will be presented later this month to both the SWG and AHSC after the data is processed. Generally, the survey confirmed that the current economic conditions are not conducive for support in 2011 or 2012. Going to dig in and see what resonates or doesn't and possibly hold focus groups. Will get recommendations from the SWG and AHSC to bring results to Board then will.

Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League, asked which committee is meeting next to receive the survey results. Mr. Rundle responded the next committee meeting is the AHSC on July 22, 2011, and that the SWG will receive the results on July 20, 2011.

Vice Chair Grim followed up and asked if this survey revealed whether the interviewee understood the concept of preserving habitat and open space as infrastructure which benefits water quality and other quality of life issues. Mr. Rundle stated that comparisons were made on the survey work done for the TransNet measure about which specific projects would be built in if passed. However, for this measure, the SWG and AHSC recognized that this survey should try to capture the bigger picture on what challenges there are at this point in time.

ITEM #5: AD HOC COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2012 ANNUAL FUNDING AND UPDATED FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY

Mr. Greer introduced the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), to review the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations on Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Annual Funding and a proposed updated Five-Year Funding Strategy.

Mrs. Wynn explained that the Ad Hoc Committee started by assessing the recommendations from FY 2011. The biggest changes were to use unencumbered funds from previous years for certain tasks, instead of allocating new funds for those tasks that still had funds available. However, there was an exception for the program developer to help transitioning from one year to the next without slowing the process down.

The Ad Hoc Committee recommended to continue to fund emergency land management, but to add funds at a slower rate as this fund has not been used to date. This fund has not been needed yet as other funding mechanisms could be used for issues which have arisen, such as predator control in the Batiquitos Lagoon. Also in 2012 the five year funding strategy indicates an additional cycle for California gnatcatcher monitoring, but because there is data gathered that has not been fully analyzed yet, the Ad Hoc Committee believe that it is more important to fund the analysis of this data instead of an additional year of data collection. For invertebrates, much of the focus has been on butterflies and the work on Hermes butterfly will continue. However, the Ad Hoc Committee is also recommending to potentially fund fairy shrimp research in light of recent issues on potential related to hybridization.

Mr. Greer added that the pilot open space enforcement program was successful and with funding still available. He will work with the Sheriff's Department and California Department of Fish and Game to continue these efforts. Additionally, these efforts will be tied to measurable metrics to see how successful the program is. Mr. Greer noted that there has been lots of data collection for vegetation communities, California gnatcatcher, and cactus wren monitoring. The Ad Hoc Committee is recommending that a "science forum" is needed to see the results from this data before any new fieldwork is conducted.

Bruce April, Caltrans, asked what the timeline on this is and how the Cactus Wren workshop in Orange County ties into this. Mr. Greer responded that the Ad Hoc Committee recommended Fall 2011. Additionally, Barbara Kus with the U.S. Geological Survey, has been collecting genetic samples and the USFWS has been mapping of the cactus and cactus wren linkages. However, this data needs to be analyzed.

Mrs. Wynn continued her review of Ad Hoc Committee recommendations that under Regional Coordination, the Administrative and Science Support task includes office space as well as funding contracts out to have data sets analyzed and evaluated.

Mr. Beck asked if the data on the California gnatcatcher is limited to what Clark has been collecting over the past several years or if there are other sources. Mr. Greer stated that there is lots of data on the gnatcatcher that has been collected, but it is unknown if data sets are being collected using the same methods and if they can be merged into one data set or not. Mrs. Wynn added that there may be other ways to analyze data.

Ron Rempel, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP), commented that the next steps are to look very closely are whether or not can answer the question that have been asked can be answered with data, and if the right questions are being asked. This feedback loop allows data to be utilized in the management of the preserve system, and therefore should continuously check that data is being collected and analyzed correctly.

Mr. Beck asked if the functional linkages of the overall population will be looked at. Mr. Rempel responded that for gnatcatchers this is probably a year out based upon the current schedule to do additional genetic work so can see how populations are actually linked. Mrs. Wynn added that this has already been funded by a Section 6 Grant, so this is already funded.

Mr. Rempel stated that with cactus wren, data will be available starting next year on population, linkages. This data will then be utilized to see where any additional cactus should be planted to re-form linkages.

Mrs. Wynn noted that the newly developed categories of vertebrates, invertebrates, etc. versus species specific categories allows for more flexibility. Additionally, in cases where other sources of funding can be used, the Ad Hoc Committee developed prioritizations in order to be more strategic with funds.

Chair Downey recommended that if there were no additional questions, she would request a motion to approve. Mr. April motioned to approve the AHC recommendations for FY 2012 Annual Funding and the Updated Five-Year Funding Strategy, and Vice Chair Grim seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

ITEM #6: AD HOC COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS

Mr. Greer updated the EMPWG on the FY 2011 Land Management grant cycle process. He requested that EMPWG whose departments submitted applications including Mr. Rochester and Ms. Marisa Lundstedt, Chula Vista, South County, to recuse themselves as they may not vote on this item. They left the meeting.

There were 28 grant applications received under the selected three categories of Invasive Species Control, Species Specific Management, and Habitat Maintenance, Access Control, and Volunteer Coordination. The Board approved specific amounts: \$950,000, \$650,000, and \$350,000 respectively for these three categories and the percentage of applications received for each category reflected the division of funds available. Mr. Greer noted that Ad Hoc Committee members found it difficult to take all the evaluation criteria and apply to each of the three categories. They recommended reviewing this issue when updating the grant evaluation criteria prior to the next land management grant cycle to potentially develop different criteria for each of the three categories.

Vice Chair Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad, chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on FY 2011 Land Management Grants and presented their recommendations to the EMPWG. The same process was followed as in previous grant cycles where each Ad Hoc Committee member received the grant applications, evaluated and scored applications individually, submitted evaluations to Mr. Greer, and then met to review the results of their combined overall rankings. A total of 15 projects were being suggested for funding by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Out of a total of 28 grants over half (15) were being recommended for funding. Seven out of the 14 grants for Invasive Species Control were proposed for funding. Five out of the ten grants for species specific management were proposed for funding. Three out of the four grants for habitat management/stewardship were recommended for funding.

Vice Chair Grim reviewed the AHC recommendations for projects to fund in the Species Specific Management category. Chair Downey asked if the City of Chula Vista's "20_CityCV_Salt Creek" project application included ORV causing degradation of the habitat, and if it was possible to verify how they will address causes that are not part of the application. Mr. Greer responded that this project can be conditioned to verify the management of unauthorized ORV activity. Mrs. Wynn added that this habitat has historically been unmanaged and degraded, while there are now fences that have been built and land managers are managing this area.

Anne Harvey, San Diego Conservation Network, asked if AHC members were aware that organizations like the Zoological Society have high overhead costs. Mrs. Wynn responded that grant applicants were required to show what their overhead costs are as part of their applications. Mr. Greer added that while there were no limits on what overhead applicants could list, applicants were required to provide an Indirect Cost analysis to demonstrate their estimate. On average, most applicants applied with 17 percent overhead with some using this overhead as a matching fund for the proposed grants. Mr. Rempel commented that much of the overhead and processing for Zoological Society is a match of staff costs.

Mr. April asked if the CLC's "13_CLC_Proctor Valley Missing Links Barrier" project does not end up using all the funds being approved, how leftover funds will be allocated. Mr. Greer responded that if funds are not used, they go back into the general habitat conservation fund.

Chair Downey asked if the County of San Diego received any funds for this grant cycle. Ms. Wynn responded that while the County's applications did not meet the evaluation criteria to be ranked high enough to receive funding, but there is work that will be done by other land managers, such as Proctor Valley, that were approved which will benefit the County.

Mr. Greer added that while the County submitted an interesting application for people using trails illegally, this needed to be linked up to enforcement. Therefore, while not being recommended for funding, SANDAG staff will work with the County to address this issue with the enforcement program out of separate funds that are available.

Ms. Harvey commented that this could also be used as an opportunity to create a model for all trails throughout the County. Dave Mayer, DFG, noted that the Ad Hoc Committee members also discussed trying to tie in species issues instead of just focusing on just vegetation monitoring.

The EMPWG reviewed the recommendation and conditions for each grant by their eligibility category. Chair Downey asked for a recommendation for each of the categories. Motions were made for approval for Invasive Species Control category by Chair Downey and Ms. Wynn seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition. Leann Carmichael, County of San Diego, motioned to approve the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations for the Species Specific Management category for the FY 11 Land Management grants, and Bill Tippetts, The Nature Conservancy, seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition. Susan Wynn motioned to approve the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations for the for habitat management/stewardship

category for the FY 11 Land Management grants, and Bill Tippetts, The Nature Conservancy, seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

ITEM #7: NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2011, from 1 to 3 p.m. Future agenda items include an update on the Conserved Lands Database from SANDAG staff, Grace Chung. Ms. Chung and Yvonne Moore will coordinate the distribution of this database to land managers.

Additionally, and Ad Hoc Committee will be reviewing the Land Management Grant evaluation criteria for FY 2012 and present their recommendations to the EMPWG.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:48 p.m. by Chair Downey.

San Diego Association of Governments
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
WORKING GROUP

November 8, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

Action Requested: DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

AD HOC COMMITTEE'S REVIEW OF PAST GRANT CYCLES
AND RECOMMENDATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2012
LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS

File Number 12002001

Introduction

As part of the continual process to make the land management grant program more efficient and effective, SANDAG staff requested that the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP) review the past land management grants, interview applicants, stakeholders, and past reviewers to look for opportunities for improvements. The results of the SDMMP analysis are provided as Attachment 1.

Using the information provided by the SDMMP, an ad hoc subcommittee met on October 27, 2011, and consisted of EMPWG members Susan Wynn, David Mayer, Emily Young, Bruce April, Jim Lyon, and was chaired by Mike Grim. SDMMP staff, Ron Rempel and Yvonne Moore, and SANDAG staff Keith Greer and Katie Levy were also present.

Discussion

The ad hoc committee reviewed the overall results of the SDMMP review of land management grants and their specific recommendations for changes to the Grant Submission Form and the Program Overview and Instructions. Specific changes were made throughout both documents (see Attachments 2 and 3).

A length discussion occurred on which focal species should be included for the Fiscal Year 2012 land manage grant cycle, and the development of specific criteria for each eligible activity. Vice-chair, Mike Grim, will provide a discussion on the recommended changes.

- Attachments:
1. Feedback on the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Land Management Grant Process
 2. Revised Grant Submission Form
 3. Revised Program Overview and Instructions

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org



**Feedback on the *TransNet* Environmental Mitigation Program
Land Management Grant Process
October 2011**

Prepared by Yvonne Moore

INTRODUCTION

Since FY 2006, SANDAG has solicited land management grants from land managers in San Diego County to provide funding to address regional habitat management issues such as invasive species control, post-fire recovery, habitat restoration, access control, and litter removal. The *TransNet* EMP land management grant program is designed to provide critical funding to address management efforts that if left unaddressed, could lead to regional impediments to conserving sensitive species and habitats.

In August 2011, the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP) was tasked with gathering feedback on the land management grant program from past grantees and to provide recommendations for improvements to the program for FY 2012. The SDMMP created a topic list and emailed 47 contacts from the past four grant cycles provided by SANDAG to request feedback (via email, phone, or in person) on the grant process. The topics included: overall process, eligible projects, application, and selection criteria and weighting factors (see Attachment 1). A follow-up email was sent in September by both SDMMP and SANDAG staff encouraging people to respond and mentioning that their responses would be kept confidential.

A total of 20 respondents submitted comments on the land management grant. Below is a summary of the comments received.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Overall Process

The responses received on the overall grant process were overwhelmingly positive. Grantees noted that the process went smoothly and that they appreciated that staff were open and accessible. It was also noted that this is one of the few grant programs where applicants are able to get an entire project funded as opposed to needing to find multiple funding sources. Some important comments were made that would help improve the process:

- The time from award notification to contract execution is too long. Grantees need to start hiring staff for the field season in January, but without a contract in place by October or November they cannot start the advertising and hiring paperwork in time.

- SANDAG's "Use it or Lose it" policy is too constraining, given the contracting delays, and especially for projects that need to start at a particular time of year or have to wait until the following field season to start.
- The pre-application workshop was very helpful, but grantees want more examples of good proposals and they would like to hear success stories from past projects.
- Grantees spend a considerable amount of time preparing the applications and want a better idea of SANDAG's priorities (i.e. focal species, habitats, and locations) so they can decide whether or not they should invest the time to apply. SANDAG should consider requesting a concept paper first – if the concept is selected, additional project information is then prepared and submitted for further scrutiny. This would lengthen the overall approval process, but this can be compensated by approving projects every two years instead of annually.
- More emphasis should be placed on making the public aware of projects funded by *TransNet*. A press release, signage, and a presentation of the project to the public should be required.
- The indirect cost analysis required by SANDAG is confusing and makes billing complicated. SANDAG should adopt a standard indirect cost that it will pay. Also, the budget tables in the application should include a line item for indirect costs.
- The matching funds section needs to include instructions for what counts as matching funds. It should be clarified that the matching funds need to be identified, verified, confirmed, and documented that they have not been previously used as a match.
- Grantees noted that SANDAG's requirement for quarterly reporting is excessive (but note that report contents are minimal) as not much changes on a project in 3 months.
- Grantees noted that the invoice format is confusing and that they are not getting paid in a timely fashion, especially since these are reimbursement contracts. Cities would like to receive the 10% retention at the end of a task (instead of end of project) since they have to pay their contractors when they complete a task.
- Projects often receive partial funding in the selection process and are encouraged to re-apply for the remaining funds in later years. However, few grantees have re-applied or if they have re-applied they have not been selected for the additional funding. A process for identifying projects that have received partial funding in the past and are still in good standing with SANDAG should be included.

Eligible Projects

The responses received on eligible projects for FY 2011 were mostly positive. In FY 2011, land management grant funding was divided into 3 eligible activities with specific budget amounts allocated: invasive control and habitat restoration, species-specific management, and habitat maintenance/access control/volunteer coordination. Grantees generally agreed with the categories and appreciated receiving more information on SANDAG's priorities. However, there were some constructive comments received:

- The categories were confusing for applicants who had projects that included tasks for more than one eligible activity (e.g. habitat restoration AND volunteer coordination), especially since they could only choose one category to submit a project proposal.
- There needs to be more flexibility in the funding across eligible activities. SANDAG should consider having approximate amounts identified instead of fixed amounts.
- There was some disagreement in the proportion of funding allocated for the eligible activities. It was noted that there were few applications in FY 2011 for small maintenance-type projects (e.g. fencing, benches, etc.) and that more funding should be allocated to protecting habitat from stressors/threats.
- There should be more explanation on why the specific focal species were chosen.

Application

In general, grantees liked the grant application, stating that it was straight-forward and concise. There were a few comments received that would improve the application:

- The budget tables are confusing. There needs to be line items added for indirect costs and totals. Additional columns should be added for multi-year projects.
- There should be more information on how much detail needs to be included in the task section.
- The land manager qualifications section should be reduced. Too much unnecessary information is being included.
- The schedule table needs to clarify that the project start date is the number of months from task order execution date.
- Questions 1-8 are too closely tied to the selection criteria, resulting in applicants adding “fluff” to their projects in an attempt to gain additional points.

Selection Criteria and Weighting Factors

Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the selection criteria need to be changed to reflect the three different eligible activity categories. Comments received include:

- The criterion for projects within a wildlife corridor should be changed to add co-res, which are equally important, especially for narrow endemic species.
- The criterion that describes the need for “clear-measurable results that will reduce future management costs” is hard to quantify and should be modified.
- The criterion for urgency should be eliminated since every project states that their management action is urgent; furthermore, this criterion is difficult to evaluate.
- The criterion for projects that are part of a larger strategic effort should be modified to include smaller projects that are implementing part of a larger effort.
- The criterion for matching funds is difficult to evaluate. There should be more detail on what is considered sufficient matching funds.

Feedback on the TransNet EMP Land Management Grant Program

- The criterion for using public outreach should be more specific. Many applicants add some amount of public outreach just to gain points but the amount and type needs to be standardized. The criterion should require projects to issue a press release, use signage, and give a presentation to the public, etc.

SDMMP RECOMMENDATIONS

The feedback received by the SDMMP on the *TransNet* land management grant process was largely positive and the program continues to be viewed as a success. Grantees appreciate the opportunity to receive funding for land management projects that would otherwise go unfunded. The specific comments provided by respondents were thoughtful and constructive and it is the SDMMP's recommendation that many of them should be implemented by SANDAG to improve the grants program.

The SDMMP's specific recommendations on changes were provided to an Ad Hoc Committee of EMP Working Group Members¹. The major changes are outlined below:

- The list of focal species has been modified to include priority species as identified in the draft Management Specific Plan (in development). Also, the specific management issues to be addressed for each species have been included.
- "Upland Lagoons" have been added to the list of focal habitats based on recent discussions with coastal land managers.
- The funding amounts for the eligible activity categories have been modified to include an approximate percentage instead of a fixed amount.
- The selection criteria have been modified to be more specific for each eligible activity category. Changes to the criteria have been made based on comments received.
- The budget and schedule tables in the application have been modified based on comments received.
- Questions 1-8 in the application have been modified based on comments received.
- The application has been modified to allow applicants to select more than one eligible activity for a project. The task and budget sections must now be broken out by eligible activity.

¹ The specific recommendations made by the SDMMP were used by the Ad Hoc Committee as the foundation for their recommendation's as shown on Attachment 2.

Attachment 1. Topic list for feedback on the *TransNet* Environmental Mitigation Program land management grant process.

Purpose: To gain feedback on how to improve the grant application process and evaluation criteria

- **Overall Process**
 - Pre-application workshop
 - Call for projects announcement and instructions
 - Timeline: 60 days for completing and submitting application, 30 day review by selection committee, Notice of preliminary selection 60 days from submittal
 - Indirect cost analysis
 - Matching funds
 - Number and type of project selected
 - Project funding amounts and partial project funding
 - Quarterly and final reporting, documentation for invoices, timely payment of invoices

- **Eligible Projects**
 - Funding allocation categories
 - Species-specific management \$650k
 - Invasive control and habitat restoration \$950k
 - Habitat maintenance/access control/volunteer coordination \$350k
 - Focal species and vegetation communities
 - Species: Western pond turtle, Cactus wren, Golden eagle, Nuttall's lotus, San Diego ambrosia, San Diego thornmint, Short-leaved dudleya, Sticky dudleya, Orcutt's spineflower
 - Vegetation Communities: Grasslands, Maritime Succulent Scrub/Coastal Bluff Scrub, Coastal Sage Scrub, Riparian and Inland Aquatic Systems, including Vernal Pools

- **Application**
 - First page project summary and quantification of expected results
 - Funding Needs Summary table
 - Project Purpose - Questions 1-8
 - Scope of Work by Task
 - Budget by Task table
 - Project Schedule table

- **Selection Criteria and Weighting**
 - Lack of management...may result in extirpation of species (5)
 - Species or vegetation of highest risk is addressed (5)
 - Critical linkage or wildlife corridor (4)

Feedback on the TransNet EMP Land Management Grant Program

- Success is likely, clear measurable pos. results to reduce future mgmt costs, criteria identified, will be monitored and reported (5)
- Urgent action needed to address problem that would severely degrade sensitive veg. community (5)
- Project part of larger strategic effort, covers large area, multiple partners & benefits (3)
- Sufficient matching funds (3)
- Promotes public awareness through public outreach and participation (2)



Grant Submission Form

For Consideration for *TransNet* Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)
Fiscal Year 201~~2~~⁴ Funding for Land Management

(Applications cannot exceed twelve (12) pages, including all attachments.)

Applicant Name¹: _____

Address: _____

Phone and Email Address:

Name of Property: _____

General Location: _____

Jurisdiction: _____

Total Acres: _____

Estimated Acres Requiring Management: _____

Owner(s) of Property²: _____

Land manager(s) of property (include name(s)): _____
~~years of experience managing habitat lands, existing land management responsibilities, and references):~~

Application is proposed for consideration under the following eligible activity area (pick all that apply~~only one~~. A separate budget must be submitted for each eligible activity category):

- Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration*
- Species-Specific Management*
- Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management, and Volunteer Coordination*

Brief Project Summary that includes your primary goal and objectives (200-word maximum)

¹ While collaboration is encouraged in the development of the grant proposal, the proposal must identify one organization as the lead entity which will enter into an Agreement with SANDAG.

² If the applicant is not the landowner, please submit a letter or right-of-entry permit from the land owner granting permission to perform the land management duties as outlined in the application. Failure to provide the letter or right-of-entry permit will lead to disqualification of the application. **Attach letter or right-of-entry permit if applicable.**

Quantify Expected Results (add bullets as necessary)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • •
Brief Description of dedicated staff and/or consultants that would work on Project (200-word maximum)

Funding Needs Summary

1. Please indicate how much funding is being requested from SANDAG and any matching funding proposed:

Budget Item	Requested Funding Amount	Proposed Matching Funds*	Description
Personnel Expenses Staff	\$ _____	\$ _____	Includes staff time for non-administrative work on the project
Personnel Administrative Expenses	\$ _____	\$ _____	Includes all staff time to administer the contract
Consultant Expenses	\$ _____	\$ _____	Includes all costs for consultant services
Other Direct Expenses	\$ _____	\$ _____	Includes all equipment, supplies, millage, etc.
Indirect Costs ³	\$ _____	\$ _____	All indirect charges (e.g., overhead) on the project, if any.
Totals	\$ _____	\$ _____	

*if applicable

2. Are there matching funds available? If yes, how are the matching funds assured (100-word maximum)?

Yes No

Explain how matching funds are assured.

PROJECT PROPOSAL

(Maps and/or graphics can be referenced and pasted at the end of this Word document or attached as a separate digital file.)

The proposal will include the purpose of the project, the scope of work by tasks, proposed budget, including matching funds, by task, and a schedule for each task. Applicants must clearly identify their proposed tasks in the scope of work, funding requested for each task (please

³ Indirect Costs are only allowable with either: (1) an indirect cost allocation audit approved by a qualified independent auditor or (2) the applicant's proposed method for allocating indirect costs must be submitted in accordance with [OMB guidelines](#) and approved by SANDAG. Indirect costs will not be reimbursed until one of the two conditions above are satisfied and indirect cost allocation plans must be renewed annually.

identify staff hours and cost separately from consultant costs), start and end dates of the tasks, and deliverables. Applicants are encouraged to identify phasing and prioritization of tasks in their proposal in case full funding for the project is not available.

A. Project Purpose

Address the following in the proposal.

1. What eligible management activities will be done on the property and why? Describe the proposed management activity(ies) and why needed. Is there current management occurring or has past management occurred (please describe)? How will this project benefit sensitive vegetation communities and/or sensitive species (i.e. focal, covered, threatened or endangered)?
1. —
2. What is the biological significance of the property for endangered or covered species, sensitive habitats, core habitat areas, wildlife linkages, and/or regional habitat conservation planning? Describe the geographic area of the project, including adjacent surrounding properties and landowners, and the current conditions of the vegetation communities and sensitive species of the project area. Is the project area already part of an approved regional conservation plan and if so, how does the proposed project contribute to the plan?
3. Describe the stressors and/or threats to the vegetation communities and/or sensitive species in the project area. Does the site area suffer from natural, human, or domestic animal disturbance (e.g., urban development, invasive/exotic species, altered fire regime, altered hydrology, herbivory/predation, pesticides/rodenticides/herbicides, parasitism and disease, powerline and windpower facilities, roads, human use/off road vehicle use, uncontrolled access, unauthorized grazing, fire, flooding, erosion, exotic species invasion, and/or feral cats)?
4. Describe why action is needed to prevent the vegetation communities and/or sensitive species from degrading further. Is immediate action needed to address a problem to prevent the site from degrading further? Would the further degradation potentially affect covered species?
5. Does the proposal use efficient and proven methods and/or strategies to address the land management needs that would result in a high likelihood of success and reduce future land management costs (e.g., control of small outbreak of aggressive exotic species, fencing to prevent damage to rare plant populations)? Describe the management techniques proposed and whether or not they have been successfully used previously and where. Are there any negative effects to other sensitive species and/or vegetation communities that could result from the proposed management action?
6. Does the proposal implement a strategic approach which covers large geographic areas (e.g., watershed or subwatershed extent) involving multiple partners and providing multiple benefits (e.g., part of a larger coordinated effort that is high economy of scale)? What strategic approach will be used to ensure the successful, long-term outcome of the proposed project (e.g. upstream exotic removal prior to downstream, future on-going maintenance)? Which adjacent conserved lands will not be included and why?
7. What are the goals and objectives for the project? How would the project result in measurable biological success to implement the Natural Communities Conservation Program regional preserve system? What measurable results would be used to determine success of the project? Project criteria/metrics will be used to measure success? If applicable, what quantitative monitoring data will be collected to evaluate success? Who will be collecting the monitoring data and what are their qualifications?
8. How would the project involve public outreach/public participation ~~for~~, volunteers and/or community events to highlight identify the land management activities being funded and promote awareness of grant-funded project? ~~In your proposal p~~ please quantative your response as much as possible estimate the following, if any:
9. How will the project manage the data collected? What software will be used to house the data? Who will be responsible for compiling and transferring the data to SANDAG? Who will be preparing the required reports?

10. [Has the project received TransNet EMP funds previously? If so, what was accomplished with the funds and why are additional funds being requested?](#)

11. [Is the proposed activity being done on land that was previously set aside as mitigation? If yes, please elaborate.](#)

B. Scope of Work by Task

Please break down the proposal into discrete tasks with a task name, description of each task, quantify expected results, and discrete deliverables for each task. Note: make sure to include tasks for both quarterly reporting on the status of the grant project and a final report on the outcome of the grant project. The applicant should choose one of the three eligible activities, described in the Call for Projects that best characterizes their project for consideration under this grant program. [EXAMPLE \[add tasks and bullets as necessary\]:](#)

Task 1: [name of task]

Eligible Activity: [\[choose one from the three eligible activity areas\]](#)

Description: [\[describe task\]](#)

Deliverables: [\[list the deliverables\]](#)

[○](#)

[○](#)

Task 2: [name of task]

Eligible Activity: [\[choose one from the three eligible activity areas\]](#)

Description: [\[describe task\]](#)

Deliverables: [\[list the deliverables\]](#)

[○](#)

[○](#)

C. Budget by Task

Please include a specific budget for each task described in the Scope of Work (section B above). This should include both requested SANDAG funds and any matching funds proposed. [If matching funds are proposed, please distribute the match commitment proportionately throughout the project budget.](#) For projects requesting funding for more than one year, please indicate the requested funding and match for each year. Applicants are encouraged to identify phasing in their proposal in case full funding for the project is not available. You may add or subtract rows and columns as needed (or insert an Excel spreadsheet). [Example Budget:](#)

Task # and Name	Total Project Cost	Grant Request	Total Match	Year 1 Grant Request	Year 1 Match	Year 2 Grant Request	Year 2 Match	Year 3 Grant Request	Year 3 Match
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
SubTotal	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Indirect Cost (____%)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

TOTAL	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
-------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

D. Project Schedule

Please include a specific start and end date for each task described in the Scope of Work (section B above). This should include both tasks by number and the month and year of the start and end dates. Please include tasks for both quarterly reporting on the status of the grant project and a final report on the outcome of the grant project. You may add or subtract row and columns as needed (or insert an Excel spreadsheet).

<u>Task # and Name</u>	<u>Proposed Start*</u>	<u>Days Needed to Complete Task</u>	<u>Task Ends*</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

* Number of days to start or end project from notice to proceed.

NOTICE REGARDING PREVAILING WAGES

SANDAG's EMP Land Management Grants are funded with *TransNet* revenues consistent with the *TransNet* Extension Ordinance adopted by the voters in November 2004, (SANDAG Ordinance 04-01). Although SANDAG Ordinance 04-01 does not require payment of prevailing wages, a recent appellate court case (Asuza Land Partners v. Department of Industrial Relations 191 Cal. App. 4th 1 (2010)), may require that *TransNet*-funded public works projects pay prevailing wages to workers. The Asuza case held, in part, that all construction of public improvements required as a condition of regulatory approval is subject to prevailing wage law, including public infrastructure constructed at private expense. Before submitting a grant application to SANDAG, applicants are strongly encouraged to seek advice from an attorney regarding whether the Asuza case will subject the proposed grant project to prevailing wage laws consistent with Labor Code Section 1720 *et seq.* If awarded an EMP Land Management Grant, the grant agreement between SANDAG and the grantee requires grantee's compliance with all federal, state and local laws and ordinances applicable to the agreement.

REQUIRED STATEMENTS FROM GRANTEE

- Yes No The proposed grantee has read the standardized agreement.
- Yes No If the SANDAG Board of Directors approves the grant, the proposed grantee agrees to sign and return the standardized agreement to SANDAG, without exceptions, within 45 days of receipt.
- Yes No The proposed grantee agrees to comply with SANDAG's Board Policy 035 "Competitive Grant Program Procedures," which outlines "use-it-or-lose-it" project milestone and completion deadlines. Board Policy 035 is included in the standardized agreement, and is also on SANDAG's website at the following link: http://www.sandag.org/organization/about/pubs/policy_035.pdf
- Yes No The proposed grantee understands that that 10% of all invoices will be retained until the completion of the project.
- Yes No The proposed grantee understands that that all invoices must be accompanied by written support of the charges for both requested reimbursement of grant funds and matching funds.
- Yes No The proposed grantee understands that approval of funding by the SANDAG Board of Directors, the applicant will provide a copy of their approved indirect rate audit or their proposed methodology to SANDAG for review and approval which must occur prior to the execution of the grant agreement.
- Yes No The proposed grantee understands that a resolution including the requirements of Board Policy 035, Section 4.1, must be submitted to SANDAG at least two weeks prior to the recommendation by the Regional Planning Committee of the list of grant projects to be considered eligible. SANDAG will provide applicants with advance notice of the Regional Planning Committee's anticipated meeting date.
- Yes No The proposed grantee agrees to submit project data/information to SANDAG in a format compatible with the regional management database.

I have the authorization to submit this grant on behalf of my organization.

Grantee Name/Title (print or type)

Grantee Signature mm/dd/yy
Date

**ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP)
FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS –
PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS**

Program Description

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as approved by the voters on November 2, 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The EMP is a funding allocation category for the costs to mitigate habitat impacts for regional transportation projects. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement regional habitat conservation plans.

On XXXX, XX 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved land management and monitoring activities and a budget for FY 2011. The Board approved \$2.01 million for management projects related to 1) Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration 2) Species-specific Management Actions, and 3) Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer Coordination.

Eligible Projects

SANDAG has allocated \$2.01 million to address invasive species control and restoration of degraded habitat areas, management to preclude damage caused by human use, and species-specific management. Review of the monitoring data collected since 1997 indicates some species and habitats are at significant risk due to a variety of stressors and that action is needed to reverse downward trends in habitat or species conditions. It is envisioned that the \$2.01-95 million would be part of a multi-year strategic approach that includes one or more of the following **eligible activities**:

1. Habitat Restoration and Invasive Control ~~and Habitat Restoration~~ (approximately 40% of available funds \$950,000) – Projects that reduce existing or emerging invasive species that threaten endangered and/or other sensitive species **AND** that engage in active habitat restoration on degraded habitat lands to promote recovery of native vegetation communities and/or threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species habitat. Projects that focus on the following vegetation communities will be given the highest priority for funding:
 - Native Grasslands
 - Maritime succulent scrub/Coastal bluff scrub
 - Coastal sage scrub
 - Riparian and Inland aquatic systems, including Vernal pools
 - Associated uplands around bays and lagoons.
2. Species-Specific Management (approximately 40% of available funds \$650,000) – Projects that focus on managing species at risk of extirpation to species covered under the regional habitat conservation plans, generally by identifying and reducing threats, and that include monitoring to demonstrate success at increasing or stabilizing populations. ~~Pursuant to a regional assessment of monitoring efforts conducted in 2010, the~~ following species have

been determined to be the highest at risk species in the region where land management activities could benefit existing populations. Projects that focus on the following species will be given the highest priority for funding:

- ~~Western pond turtle~~
- ~~Coastal cactus wren~~
- ~~Golden Eagle~~
- ~~Nuttall's lotus~~
- ~~San Diego ambrosia~~
- ~~San Diego thornmint~~
- ~~Short-leaved dudleya~~
- ~~Sticky dudleya~~
- ~~Orcutt's spineflower~~

<u>Species</u>	<u>General management Issue to be Addressedⁱ</u>
<u>California least tern (DISCUSSION REQUIRED BY EMPWG)</u>	<u>Reduce threats and improve structure of nesting habitat to support > 150 nesting pairs</u>
<u>Western snowy plover (DISCUSSION REQUIRED BY EMPWG)</u>	<u>Maintain and enhance nest sites where associated with California least tern</u>
Coastal cactus wren	<u>Reduce predation by managing vegetation. Maintain and enhance nesting habitat</u>
Golden Eagle	<u>Repair/replace nests and/or install nest ledges. Reduce threats.</u>
<u>Northern harrier</u>	<u>Create new nesting opportunities. Maintain and enhance existing nesting areas</u>
<u>Tricolored blackbird</u>	<u>Maintain and enhance nesting areas/water at or near historic nesting sites</u>
<u>American badger</u>	<u>Restore and enhance known nest burrows</u>
<u>Quino checkerspot</u>	<u>Restore and expand suitable habitat</u>
<u>Otay Mesa mint</u>	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
<u>California Orcutt's grass</u>	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
<u>Spreading navarretia</u>	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
<u>Thread-leaved brodiaea</u>	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
San Diego thornmint	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
<u>Dehesa beargrass</u>	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
Nuttall's lotus	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
Short-leave dudleya	<u>Stabilize population have shown declines. Reduce threats.</u>
Orcutt's spineflower	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>
<u>Willow monardella</u>	<u>Increase number and size of populations</u>

2.3. Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer —Coordination (approximately 20% of available funds \$350,000) – Regular day-to-day habitat maintenance, management of public use combined with monitoring of effects on species and habitats, and the coordination of volunteer programs to implement management actions. This includes signage (both interpretive and cautionary), education, erosion control, culvert maintenance, fencing, patrolling public use, costs related to volunteer coordination, law enforcement, and efforts to remove garbage in existing preserve systems to allow habitat areas to recover. Eligible projects also include data collection/monitoring to:

- Determine the effects –in public use on species and vegetation communities
- Track types, quantity, and seasonality of public use
- Assess areas for compatible public use prior to allowing access.

Projects that are not ready to start within 12 months of submission of the application to SANDAG will not be eligible for this funding cycle. Projects approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors for funding, that do not start within one year of will be at risk of losing their funding. Projects will only be funded for a maximum of **3** years initially.

Process for Allocating the Funds

SANDAG will accept project proposals from land managers in San Diego County that will benefit regional conservation planning under the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program. The applicant must own the land, or be designated to manage the land by the land owner by contract or other written form of legal documentation and should have any applicable state and federal permits prior to the initiation of work. The land must be conserved as open space for natural resources. Representatives of the land owner and land manager must be identified on the application form and be authorized in writing to enter into a contract agreement with SANDAG.

Applicants must complete a Grant Submission application (Attachment 2) that does not exceed 12 pages. The proposal will include the purpose of the project, the scope of work, timeline, and costs. Applicants must clearly identify their proposed tasks in the scope of work, funding requested for each task, start and end dates of the tasks, and deliverables.

All project proposals will be reviewed for eligibility, ranked, and prioritized as described below. A list of recommended projects will be submitted for consideration to the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Working Group and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), and the projects are subject to approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Successful applicants will then be required to enter into a contract with SANDAG for grant funding. Successful applicants will be required to submit quarterly reports on their progress and a final summary report of the project's contribution to promote habitat conservation in the region along with the final invoice.

Who Will Score The Projects?

An evaluation committee will be made up of EMP Working Group members and/or other qualified individuals who do not have an affiliation with any of the proposed projects. The committee will include people with knowledge of the regional preserve system and land management.

Project Evaluation and Ranking

The following evaluation and ranking criteria will be used by the evaluation committee.

|

Eligible Activity: [Habitat Restoration Projects and Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration Projects](#)

Project Evaluation Criteria	Point Range	Weight	Maximum Score Possible	Total Score
Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species	0-5	5	25	—
Project addresses a species or focal or other high priority vegetation community at highest risk of loss.	0-5	5	25	
Project site is located within an identified Critical habitat linkage parcels or core area in regional wildlife corridor	0-5	54	250	
Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results. <u>Project includes goals, objectives, and use of conceptual models that identifies proposed management actions which will reduce future land management costs.</u> Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High Cost Effectiveness)	0-5	5	25	
Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community	0-5	5	25	
Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large geographic area and has with multiple partners and multiple benefits? <u>High Economy of Scale OR Project is an important part of a larger effort already underway to restore habitat and control invasive species.</u>	0-5	3	15	
Sufficient M atching funds <u>are</u> available to complete implement the project.	0-5	3	15	
Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation.	0-5	23	1015	
Total			160145	

Eligible Activity: Species-Specific Management

Project Evaluation Criteria	Point Range	Weight	Maximum Score Possible	Total Score
Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species	0-5	5	25	_____
Project addresses a focal or other high priority species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss. Population is within a major, critical, or core population as identified by the regional habitat conservation plans, or meets the criteria for inclusion.	0-5	5	25	
Project site is located within an identified habitat linkage or core area. Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor	0-5	5	25	
Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results. Project includes goals, objectives, and use of conceptual models that identifies proposed management actions. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High Cost-Effectiveness)	0-5	5	25	
Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community	0-5	4	20	_____
Project covers a large geographic area and has contains multiple partners and multiple benefits AND/OR Project is an important part of a larger effort already underway to recover a priority species. Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large	0-5	3	15	_____

area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High Economy-of-Scale				
Matching funds are available to complete the project. Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project	0-5	34	155	
Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation. Signage will be posted and a press release will be made to promote the project and advertise the fund source as TransNet EMP.	0-5	23	1045	
Total			130145	

Eligible Activity: Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer Coordination

Project Evaluation Criteria	Point Range	Weight	Maximum Score Possible	Total Score
Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species	0-5	5	25	—
-Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss.	0-5	1	5	—
<u>The Project activity site is located within an identified habitat linkage or core area. Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</u>	0-5	<u>5</u>	<u>25</u>	
Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results. Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High Cost-Effectiveness)	0-5	5	25	
Urgent Action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community or species.	0-5	3	15	
Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High Economy of Scale	0-5	4	20	—
Matching funds are available to complete the project. Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project	0-5	3	15	
<u>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public participation and volunteer coordination.</u> Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land	0-5	<u>4</u>	<u>20</u>	

management through public outreach and participation				
Total			145135	

Proposed Schedule

, **201209** – A call for projects is provided to interested stakeholders including in SANDAG’s EMP TransNet EMP stakeholder database. A call for projects will also be posted on the SANDAG Web site.

, **2012** – Applications are due to SANDAG. One signed hard copy, and one electronic version emailed to kgr@sandag.org.

, **2012** – The evaluation committee will review and rank projects following the criteria above and forward the proposals to the EMP Working Group for consideration.

, **2012** – The EMP Working Group will recommend a list of prioritized projects to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees who will be asked to recommend a list of land management projects for funding. The list of projects will be subject to approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors.